

the largest debate tournament on record in the U.S. with 282 teams entering the Denver 2002 event. Meanwhile, the author's observation from attending and hosting literally hundreds of tournaments over the past twenty years, is that tournaments with a rich tradition in CEDA, witnessed a general decline in entries within the CEDA divisions. This has happened with such regularity that it is now difficult to find enough tournaments that offer CEDA divisions to make the commitment of time and resources necessary to remain competitive in CEDA effective in some regions.

Once again, people began to sense an end to the debate over research, and again, this did not occur. With fewer CEDA tournaments to attend at the local and regional level, resource-limited programs have made the transition into NPDA; when they do this, they bring their biases with them. A quick check of the Parli-L, the list-serve for NPDA participants, will lead the reader to the current trends in NPDA. Ziegelmueller could be paraphrased at this juncture by saying that theoretical issues similar to those that plagued CEDA debate ten or so years ago are often the focus of current NPDA contests. Advocates within the NPDA are now arguing that NPDA debaters should be allowed to use evidence within the round. It has even been suggested that tournament directors should announce a topic/resolution focus area from which all resolutions within the tournament will be drawn. They might even mail out research packets in advance, which the debaters would then be "encouraged" to use to do research prior to their entry. In some cases, once the resolution is announced, there is a mad rush for the extemp files to search for information that theoretically cannot be directly quoted in the upcoming round. In addition, many teams are now running very complex "canned" cases – replete with "specialized knowledge" only hinted at or propped up with nebulous "I saw it on CNN" cites – which are often last year's CEDA or Lincoln-Douglas (LD) cases linked to the current resolution in only the most spurious of manners. In fact, but for a dozen or so evidence cards in the Prime Minister's Speech and four or five evidence cards in the Member of Government's "off case" attacks, competitive rounds in NPDA are exactly the same as the CEDA rounds this author competed in during the late 70s and early 80s.

Surely, this "research necessary to educational outcomes" debate can now end. No, the end of this debate is not in sight. In early 1985, Alan Cirlin, of St. Mary's University in San Antonio, TX, presented the debate community with a "modest proposal." Cirlin had become so disillusioned with the changes that had redefined the theory and practice of CEDA, that he began to experiment with a format of debate he called "public debate." Cirlin and Rogers (2000) explain the theoretical foundations of public debate as:

Academic debate is a training ground where our students learn to perform very specific oral communication skills to succeed in a highly selective sub-culture. Ideally, the skills they thus acquire will be transferable to the larger sub-cul-

tures of education, business, law, and politics. Our intent is to *educate*. But does the rhetorical model we are teaching and reinforcing through current competition practices successfully teach communication strategies, which our students will find useful in their post-graduation world? Are we enhancing their chances of survival? Will what we teach transfer? (1)

It is argued that research is not necessarily, in and of itself, the reason that previous models have failed to strike a balance between the need to speed when speaking and the rhetorical delivery model (Cirlin 1997; Cirlin & Rogers, 2000; Rogers 2001). What is needed is a sociological approach rather than rule changes that are aimed at restructuring or reinforcing a nebulous set of rhetorical standards that are not uniformly enforced by the professional critics in the back of the room. Change the way the forensic community views itself and debate, and you will make significant changes in the *practice* of debate.

The International Public Debate Association (IPDA - renamed in 1998 due to a significant increase in international member programs) format attempts to balance the delivery aspects of a slower, more persuasive, audience adaptive style with a longer preparation time (30 minutes) wherein the debaters may consult any research material they choose to aid them in the formulation of their case positions. While popular in the south-central and central areas of the U.S., the "public" experiment is also undergoing philosophical challenges. As CEDA and NPDA debaters cross over into public debate, they, once again, bring their biases with them. "Canned" cases have begun to surface replete with "specialized knowledge" watered down with those all too familiar "I saw it on CNN" cites. The speed at which these "canned cases" are advanced and responded to in the "off case spread" are reminiscent of the CEDA and LD rounds this author coached and judged in the mid- to late-1980s. If visionaries from other philosophies and formats of debate enter the IPDA community, does the community assimilate them, changing their *practices* as the "Public" experiment hopes? It is difficult to say; however, if one examines the history of the activity, the influx of traditional policy debaters into the CEDA community gradually changed Jack Howe's vision into the realization of his worst nightmare. NPDA is changing gradually towards more research-friendly philosophies, due, in part, to the influx of disaffected CEDA participants looking for a new and different home.

Will the IPDA experiment survive the next few years? Will the NPDA eventually add the limited use of evidence to its format, and thus, morph into a reconstructionist vision of Jack Howe's CEDA as originally conceptualized? Will research-intensive formats continue to decline in terms of numbers? The answer is unknown; however, three conclusions can be drawn from this short exposition on the evolution of debate over the past two-and-a-half decades:

- 1.) No matter how much the community may try to lessen the role and impact of evidence in debate, the activity continually evolves or de-evolves towards its necessity; and,
- 2.) No matter how much the community may try to lessen the role and impact of communicative delivery in debate, the activity continually evolves or de-evolves towards its necessity; and finally,
- 3.) No matter how much some members of the community attempt to swing the pendulum of debate format towards the "research over delivery" or "delivery over depth of content" positions, the forensics community, as a whole, continually introduces "experiments" that strive for symmetry between the two exclusionary agendas. The model is synergistic.

Perhaps, Pelczynski, Director of Poland's School for Young Social and Political Leaders, summed up this phenomenon best when he asked, "Is there no balance between these perspectives that would enable students to do well in both styles?" The forensic community's history of continual adjustments to attempt to balance the tug and pull of the competing philosophies would seem to indicate that there is value to both perspectives and practices.

In order to better understand this author's position, consider three "real world" scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Business

No one would dispute that the abilities to conduct quality research, to organize those findings in a meaningful, compelling manner, and to present those findings in a clear, communicative, persuasive manner are absolutely essential to survival in the business world. When assigning a project, the boss expects the employee to be able to perform these critical functions, often under pressure. One of those pressures is almost always the time available. In some cases, the boss may give the employee two weeks to "get the project / presentation together," allotting a full hour for the actual presentation/discussion. On the day of the presentation, the boss may decide, due to other more pressing issues on the agenda, to give the employee twenty minutes. Would it be appropriate to speed through the delivery? Then again, the boss may by the employee's office and tell the employee that a ten-minute presentation on "X" will be needed before the close of business that day. Would it be appropriate to skip the research and focus on the presentation delivery? To remain successful, the speaker must be able to adapt the skills learned, in this case scenario though debate experience, to the specifics of the "real world" environment. In neither example would it be appropriate for the employee to do inferior research, though the depth of research would be different. In neither example would it be appropriate to deliver the presentation in an inferior, uncommunicative manner; both research and delivery skills

are critical to success. Thinking quickly on one's feet, resisting the urge to panic, and accessing the cognitive files of generalized knowledge on the presentation subject that are already at the speaker's disposal are all skills learned through all formats of debate.

Scenario 2 – The Law

Again, the ability to conduct quality research, organize, and communicate effectively are absolutely essential to someone's success as an attorney. The vast majority of successful attorneys, however, will quickly point out the difference between arguing a case before a judge and arguing the same basic facts in front of a jury. Judges are trained in and have a deep understanding of the law; jurors do not. The depth of research, the complexities of the legal issues, and how one presents those findings to a judge are vastly different than persuading a jury. In this case, the attorney's ability to adapt his/her skills to the "real world" of the courtroom will determine your success. Good attorneys do not do less research in preparation for a jury trial; they often do much more. The difference is in how the fruits of that research are presented. Again, both skills – research and delivery – are critical to one's success. All formats of debate are useful in developing this balance. CEDA and NDT make use of highly trained critics with a depth of understanding in the complexities of policy debate. NPDA and IPDA often use lay judges with less understanding of the formal rules of debate, but who still possess keen minds and understand the basics of argumentation and persuasion. One can easily see the analogous relationship between the practice of law in the courtroom and the different types of academic debate.

Scenario 3 – Education

Years of preparation through education-based research go into the making of a teacher. Elementary, secondary, post-secondary teachers and professors vary in the levels of research and specialization they undertake. Some of these levels of education require different types and amounts of research and specialization as well as differing levels of commitment to research programs. For example, most people think of college and university professors as needing to follow some exploration and application of the issues germane to their particular academic discipline. Does that specialization and research preparation excuse terrible teaching delivery in the classroom? All students have probably suffered under the well-meaning, very knowledgeable professor who is an expert in an academic field but just cannot teach. No matter how much knowledge a professor may possess, if the material cannot be communicated successfully to the students, the professor is considered a failure. Again, both skills of research and delivery must be adapted to the "real world" experience to achieve success.

What, then, would successful debaters who have chosen any of these three career paths need to draw out of their debate experiences in order to be successful? While Table 1 is certainly not an exhaustive

list of all of the skills that a debater might learn and adapt to his or her post-graduation, "real world" survival strategies, it does serve the purpose of outlining how the experiences gained from both types or formats of debate are dependent upon one another for flexibility and adaptive effectiveness. John Chaffee (1999), in his book, Thinking Critically points to the interconnectedness of these skills as the ability to logically analyze data to arrive at a reasoned decision. Once that decision has been made, the effective use of language to clarify thoughts and communicate them effectively and persuasively is essential to the influencing of others. After a careful examination of the lists below, which skills would forensic educators identify as being useless to a student's future survival? The isolation of these skills would be dangerous. For example, if one had the ability to think quickly on his/her feet, but not to think reflectively when given the time, it would be disastrous. Conversely, if a person could only think reflectively and only produce a quality product if free from any sort of external constraint, such as time, it would be equally disastrous. The skills reflected in Table I are the result of the author's observations and discussions with colleagues representing both sides of the forensics debate.

TABLE 1
Valuable Forensics Skills that have "Real World" Applications

Research		Delivery	
<i>Intensive (Policy)</i>	<i>Non-Intensive (NPDA)</i>	<i>Intensive (Policy)</i>	<i>Non-Intensive (NPDA)</i>
*The ability to conduct in-depth analysis of issues when time is not an issue	*The ability to quickly access a broad-based, generalized knowledge when time is critical	*Use & command of highly specific language or jargon	*Use & command of generalized language
*The ability to think reflectively	*The ability to think quickly on your feet	*Ability to adapt to and persuade an audience of a highly specialized or technical nature	*Ability to adapt & persuade lay audiences
*The ability to test various solutions and approaches to problem solving;	*The ability to control and access a broad reading base.	*Ability to adapt messages to a highly contextualized structure that is rule-based.	*Ability to adapt messages to more rhetorically based elements of Style.
*The ability to weigh and test evidence for validity and applicability.	*Quick, decisive decision-making skills.		

John Chaffee (2000), in his book, Thinking Critically points to the interconnectedness of these skills as the ability to logically analyze data to arrive at a reasoned decision . . . Once that decision has been made, the effective use of language to clarify thoughts and communicate them effectively and persuasively is essential to the influencing of others. After a careful examination of the lists below, which skills would forensic educators identify as being useless to a student's future survival? The isolation of these skills would be dangerous. For example, if one had the ability to think quickly on his/her feet, but not to

think reflectively when given the time, it would be disastrous. Conversely, if a person could only think reflectively and only produce a quality product if free from any sort of external constraint, such as time, it would be equally disastrous.

Debaters can and do gain from participating in both research-intensive and non-intensive formats of debate. Directors of Forensics should encourage their students to experience both types of debate before they "settle in" to their individual preferences. How might the forensic community balance that "encouragement?" What if the debate community borrowed from the concept of Panetta where he argued that evidence-intensive, policy debate reflects the cultural trend from "generalization" to "specialization"? Panetta commented, "the best debater is no longer the 'most generally intelligent' student but rather 'the specialist.' Today, the best debaters are the students who focus their energies on the specific topic . . . inherent in this emphasis is the stress placed on the research skills of the students" (71-72). Panetta concludes "competitive debate aims to nurture the leaders of society who have better research skills and can understand complex issues of society" (in Makino, 2000, 116).

First, notice that Panetta says that debate reflects the cultural trend from "generalization" to "specialization." Undergraduates must first master a general core of broad-based subjects before moving on to their more "specialized" classes within their majors and minors. The bachelor's degree they receive is less "specialized" than their master's, which is less "specialized" than their Ph.D. Educators of higher education start their careers in entry-level jobs, and as they are promoted, they begin to "specialize" more and more. Both examples are reflective of this cultural trend FROM "generalization" TO "specialization." The from is emphasized because it assumes, as does the U.S. system of higher education, that certain foundational, generalized knowledge is fundamental to intellectual growth. Without the foundation, higher-order learning cannot take place effectively. Perhaps, it might be useful to consider non-research intensive, higher-level communication formats as the more "generalized" foundation. Once the students have mastered basic debate, less in-depth research, basic organization and persuasive delivery skills, they might be "encouraged" to increase their level of "specialization" by investigating CEDA or NDT. This would not reflect a huge paradigm shift for most program directors and coaches.

Many already foster this kind of building-block, experiential learning model by "encouraging" their debaters to enter extemporaneous speaking and impromptu. The assumption is that these foundational speaking and research experiences will assist them in becoming better debaters. Once they master these basic skills, they move on to persuasive speaking which requires a more in-depth analysis and research specific orientation, or communication analysis, which is often targeted toward audiences which are more technically based and looking for specific sets of theoretical knowledge, comprehension and appli-

cation.

Second, Panetta reaches the conclusion, to paraphrase, that the best debaters are the ones that focus intently on the topic and develop superior research skills. He concludes, "competitive debate aims to nurture the leaders of society who have better research skills and can understand complex issues of society." Superior thinkers and debaters, however, do not always make the best "leaders of society." One has to look no further than the 2000 U.S. Presidential debates between George W. Bush and Al Gore to see the flaw in this analysis. While Gore was certainly considered the better technical debater with more in-depth, specific knowledge of the issues likely to face the nation, Bush's more genuine, communicative style appears to have been received more positively. Leaders may surround themselves with advisors who have better research skills and who can understand complex issues, but they also need to have the ability to communicate the resulting policy decisions in a meaningful, effective manner to the rank and file of society. Effective leaders exhibit balance between their ability to think and their ability to express the product of that thinking.

Finally, individuals should be wary of the temptation to "over-specialize." If one borrows from Ziegelmüller, "CEDA had even developed much of the same kind of elitism for which NDT has often been criticized" (1990, 27), one could extend the analysis to almost any debate format: NPDA, NEDA, IPDA, CEDA, NDT, AFA-LD. What is it that compels the debate community to advance an almost xenophobic defense of any one form or format, practice or philosophy, as being the answer to the "debate as education" question? Ignoring or attempting to de-justify other formats of debate is done at the students' peril. At best, without a commitment to a balanced educational experience, the survivability of students is limited in the post-graduation "real world."

Perhaps, Goodnight (1984) advances the *generalist* view better than anyone else when he writes:

Ironically, while institutions of higher learning stand upon the threshold of discovering the importance of the training that forensics has always provided, forensic leaders are bent upon dismantling the wholistic (sic) approach once characteristic of the activity. Presently students are encouraged to participate in values debate, policy debate, or individual interpretation – each exclusively, or, alternately, one at a time. The rationale of specialization is elusive. How can the study of policy be anything but empty unless the goals of the common weal are discussed and priorities resolved? How can the study of values be anything but impotent unless means of enactment are discovered and tested? And how can devotion to the arts of expression be anything but sentimentality or bombast when the student is not encouraged to ground feeling in value and rea-

son? We have disciplines that specialize in logic, ethics, and the dramatic arts. Forensics works best and maintains its mission only when it addresses the whole person (96).

In conclusion of the issue of student extension of the debate over the need for traditionally-based research in competitive academic debate, we must answer the question advanced by Pelczynski: Is it possible to achieve a balance between research and delivery that would allow students to excel at both formats? Absolutely, providing both formats continue to be made available and students are encouraged to seek a balanced educational experience. Educators should recognize the pedagogical superiority of the depth and breadth position over the depth versus breadth position. Depth and breadth are both reflective of research skills to varying degrees and toward different purposes.

The Coaching / Professional Extension

One area that is often overlooked when the forensic community comes together to discuss the issue of research and its proper perspective and contribution to intercollegiate competitive debate is how coaches contribute to the overall research burdens of the discipline. How does our research behavior impact the perceptions of professional colleagues and peers, both within the forensic community and as citizens within the larger communities of academic departments, colleges and universities?

Table 2 reflects more contemporary data supporting the alarming trend advanced by Venette & Venette (1997), Cronn-Mills & Cronn-Mills (1997), and Brand (1997) in their monographs discussing the future of Directors of Forensics (DOFs). "A future many would like to see in forensics involves tenured Ph.D.s directing programs across the country" (Cronn-Mills & Cronn-Mills, 248). This mutually conceived future is no closer to birth. All of these scholars express their growing concern that the future and health of intercollegiate forensics is at risk as tenured positions for DOFs are lost. Over the past decade, the number of active coaches with Ph.D.s has declined from 31 to 20 percent of the overall pool reflecting a 30% decrease (See Table 2). Faculty and faculty tenure-track positions have decreased from 81% to just over 57% and from 33% to just under 21% respectively (See Table 2). During the same period, non-tenure earning and staff positions have increased by 21% and 16% respectively. The number of DOF's who receive release time in exchange for their coaching/directing duties has declined from 74% to 37% (See Table 2). Forensic professionals are losing ground in every professional measurement area. The question is why? Perhaps, more importantly, are DOFs contributing to their own demise? Goodnight (1984) warned the forensic community when he wrote, "Occasionally, the scholarly nature of the activity is forgotten. For convenience sake the simple division of the world into those who think and those who teach is accepted. Forensic pedagogy is severed from forensic research" (97).

The current professional status of forensics educators is presented in:

TABLE 2
Forensic Professional Status:

	MA	PhD.	Faculty	Staff	GA	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Non-Tenure Track	Release time
1991 ¹	.49	.31	.81	.05	.09	.33	.27	.40	.74
1995 ²	.58	.24	.72	.09	.16	.31	.20	.49	.71
2000 ³	.71	.20	.57	.26	.17	.21	.23	.56	.37

Notes:

- 1 In this study, 278 CEDA programs were respondents. Data was divided by CEDA region and the Top Twenty Programs from 1990. This data reflects the aggregate data for ninety programs ranked within the Top 10 of their respective regions.
- 2 175 respondents from the smaller CEDA organization provided data for this research. The survey instrument was identical to the instrument from the 1991 publication.
- 3 The merger of CEDA and NDT has made this data difficult from which to make direct comparisons to previous data. With more than 350 respondent programs from NPDA, CEDA, NDT and IPDA, this data should be fairly representative of the current status of forensic professionals within the U.S.

Craig Dudczak and David Zarefsky (1984) argue "both the Sedalia Conference report and several of this year's position papers assert that forensics educators should pass muster by the same tests as anyone else; they should not and do not seek lower standards." In their recommendations they argued (1) "Forensics educators should be evaluated by the same standards as their colleagues" and endorse the "traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship and service," and (2) "forensic educators should satisfy each standard at the same level of *quality* expected of their colleagues: their teaching, scholarship and service should be just as good" (25). Dudczak and Zarefsky argue "we will always be seen as 'second-class citizens' if we foster the impression that we somehow can't meet the presumably more rigorous promotion and tenure standards expected of our colleagues" (34).

It is the third element of the discussion, as mentioned above, that we should return to: forensics research and publication that need closer inspection. During the IDEA Conference discussed at the beginning of this article, Lysenko questioned forensic professionals' ability to find enough time to pursue the hectic pace of our competitive schedules and to continue to pursue programs of research and publication. Lysenko just assumed, as professors involved in the rigors of pedagogy, that DOFs would be involved in research and publication. Anecdotal evidence from this author's experiences with the *Southern Journal of Forensics*, the *International Journal of Forensics* and from fellow editors Steve Hunt and Michael Bartanen, of this publication,

could be advanced, but Table 3 reports the current state of affairs in a more global environment.

TABLE 3
Forensic Professionals' Publication/Presentation Rates:

	1991	1995	2000
Directors who publish or present	.65	.62	.53
Publications in Forensic Journals	1	.90	.88
Publications in Speech / Communication Journals	1	.71	.49
Convention papers:			
Regional	2	2	1
National	3	2.7	3
International	1	1	.9

Note: This data should be read as in 1991, 65 percent of the directors in the survey had published or presented papers at professional conventions within the past 5 years. The average director reported 1 publication in a forensics journal, 1 publication in a speech or communication journal, and had presented 2 papers at the regional level, 3 papers at the national level and 1 paper at the international level during the past five years. As in the original work, a handful of directors skewed the data with numerous publications and presentations.

The data in Table 3 points to an overall decline in productivity within and among an already low scholarship-producing forensics population. In the last decade, research and publication efforts by forensic professionals, both within forensics publications and within scholarly journals which represent their outside areas of expertise, have declined. At first glance, this decline may not seem dramatic, but it should be read and evaluated with the understanding that in all three survey groups, the numbers were skewed by a small number of DOFs who publish and present papers at conventions at a much higher rate than their peers. If these "over-productive" respondents were removed from the data base, the number of publications and presentations at conventions would decrease by 37 and 23 percent respectively (See Table 3).

What message does this apparent lack of scholarly activity send to forensic educators' peers and colleagues? If the community allows others to perceive them as less than "full-fledged" partners and colleagues within the broader profession, how can tenure-track positions be defended? Perhaps Goodnight said it best: "[A]s a gulf has widened between the activity of forensics and the scholarly discipline of speech communication, the expected result would be (and has been) a diminution of scholarship by those in forensics and concomitant lessening of academic rejuvenation through research" (98). As a result, eleven tenure and promotion battles have been lost among the survey population over the past two years. Tenure-earning faculty positions have decreased by one-third; forensic job opportunities that offer annual renewable non-tenure positions are up by over twenty percent (See Table 1). Perhaps, Lysenko was reflecting a more general-

ized perception when he observed, “. . . it is not possible to be both a good professor and a good coach.”

The final area of the professional/coaching research debate was advanced by Lysenko when he theorized at the IDEA conference that “the students lack respect for the research process and the rigors it demands, because their mentors do not seem to respect it as well.” “Maybe,” Belogoubets added, “you should be putting into practice what you are demanding of students.” Is there a link between the perspectives of student research-intensive debate and professional obligations to generate academic research? Are DOFs poor role models for the students? Are DOFs demanding more of students than they are of themselves? Given the rigorous tournament schedules, are expectations for students as well as for forensic professionals too high?

The answer to all of these questions surrounding research expectations except the last one is a qualified “yes.” There is a link between what is modeled and what is expected from students. If DOFs require long hours of intensive research in the library, should they model that behavior as well? Working alongside debaters as they research the debate topic is different than working with them. The “yes” is “qualified” because there is only so much time available to accomplish everything that has to be done to teach, coach, accomplish university service, research, and publish. This is further complicated by what seems to be a general decline in the number of DOFs who are given release time in exchange for coaching duties.

As one possible solution to meet the rigors of academic citizenship, McGee and Simerly (1997) advanced the theory of “compassionate specialization.” While it is somewhat reflective of Panetta’s “generalization” vs. “specialization” argument discussed earlier, it is more an argument supporting specialization on the part of the forensics program and its offerings. McGee and Simmerly argue “In an era of forensics specialization, no program or program director can do all things well” (282). Dwindling resources, including those of the DOF, to include personal experience and professional knowledge of a variety of debate and individual event formats are cited as obstacles to offering what they term a “full service program” (283).

This author has two immediate responses to these issues of program specialization: First, there are notable exceptions to the theory that “no one program or director can do all things well.” In this author’s opinion, one could look to Bob Derryberry of Southwest Baptist University, Bill Casey during his tenure at McNeese State University, Mike Fisher at Arkansas State University, Jorji Jarzabek at LSU-Shreveport, Scott and Gina Jensen at Webster University, Tony Allison and Eddie Skaggs at Cameron University, David Berube at South Carolina, Alan Cirlin at St. Mary’s University, Kenneth Broda-Baum at Towson, and Alfred “Tuna” Snider at Vermont as examples of program directors who have successfully handled the challenges of teaching, coaching, scholarship and service to the forensics community. The list could be extended to include many more. The key is that